

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS

Fort Worth Division

UNITES STATES OF AMERICA

v.

4:21-CR-005-O

THE BOEING COMPANY,

Defendant.

**REPLY IN SUPPORT OF MOTION TO SEEK REMEDIES
PURSUANT TO CRIME VICTIMS' RIGHTS ACT**

COME the Movants, Marti Faidah, Etmidalti, Ferry Pranata, Endang Sri Rejeki, RR Ine Yunita SI, Ulfah Kusumaningsih, Hasanuddin, Siti Fatimah, Bina Asta Mastiti, Rismayanti, Fendy, Ratna Sari Dewi, Herlina Husain, Sri Subekti, Dian Anindita Suryani, Liyanah, Mardona, Mu'Minah, Gusmardi, James Sianturi, Irianto, Emmy Delima, Nursia Manurung, Norman Purnama, Handy Wijaya, Tayeb Tahir, Meylanda Crisdiana, Sri Husman, Edi Susanto, Epi Samsul Komar, R. Ayu Ghea Sofa Anggraini, Umar Nayiri, Ferdian Putra, Iskandar, Lutfiyani Eka Putri, Ulfa Wiwit Chasanah, Abdul Rahman, Amri Syakban, Ansori, Petty Novita, Septi Riyani, Septi Dursbianti, AM I. Talib, Oey Swan Nio, Endo Prabowo, Zainal Abidin, Anzar Agustian, Ellisa, Andy Fhildyna, Tandina Sukarno Putri, Glato Kodjovi, Mohamed Farrag Mohamed Megali, Welly Chandra, Winda Juwita, Siti Anbiya G. Ishimichi, Vetri, Mimin Suratmi, Ansori, M Manik, Kiki Merdekawati, Puspawijayanti, (collectively "Movants"), by their attorneys and for their Reply in Support of their Motion to Seek Remedies Pursuant to the Crime Victims' Rights Act ("CVRA") state as follows:

ARGUMENT

Both Boeing and the Government ask this Court to deny the Movants' Motion on the basis that they lack standing because Movants are not crime victims under the CVRA. In both responses, the assertion is made to preserve a legal position for appeal purposes. Boeing's Response at 2; Government Response at 1.

This Court has already ruled on this issue and held that lawful representatives of those killed in the Boeing 737 Max Lion Air crash have standing "to assert rights under Act." Dkt at 18. There is no distinction between the Movants who were the subject of this Court's October 21, 2022 ruling and these Movants. Therefore, Movants have standing.

As to the remedies sought, Boeing complains that specific remedies were not identified in the initial Motion, while the Government correctly states that there have been communications with the Government about possible remedies. For the present time, it would be better to leave the issue of remedies to the Movants and representatives of the Government. We would also welcome the meaningful involvement of Boeing. In the event that an agreement cannot be made, we ask that the Court permit the parties to present their respective positions concerning to the Court.

WHEREFORE Movants respectfully request that their Motion to Pursue Remedies pursuant to the CVRA be granted, that the Court find Movants have standing to assert rights under the CVRA and continue the matter for status as to appropriate remedies in order to allow discussions to occur between the relevant parties.

Dated: December 19, 2022

/s/ Adrian Vuckovich

Counsel for Movants

Adrian Vuckovich
Illinois Bar No. 6207978
Collins Bargione & Vuckovich
One N. LaSalle Street, Suite 300
Chicago, Illinois 60602

Tel: (312) 372-7813
av@cb-law.com

Jason R. Marlin
Texas State Bar No. 24050989
BAILEY BRAUER PLLC
8350 N. Central Expressway, Suite 650
Dallas, Texas 75206
Tel: (214) 360-7433
jmarlin@baileybrauer.com

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

A true and correct copy of the foregoing was electronically served on December 19, 2022, on all counsel of record via the Court's ECF system.

/s/ Adrian Vuckovich